

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office dated April 3, 2007, claims 1 to 15 and 32 to 76 are presented for examination, of which claims 1, 32, 47, and 62 are independent. Claims 32 to 76 have been newly added. Withdrawn claims 16 and 17 have been newly cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the cancelled claims in a continuation application.

**Drawing Objections**

The Office Action objected to the drawings based on the degraded legibility of the Patent Office's scanned copy. Replacement drawings are attached. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the drawing objection is respectfully requested.

**Specification Objection**

The Office Action objected to the specification due to incorrect paragraph numbering. In a telephone interview of July 3, 2007 the Examiner agreed to withdraw this rejection since the application has already been published and any issued patent would not use such paragraph numbers.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1 to 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In this regard, claim 1 has been amended to recite the rectangular area of pixels includes one or more lines of pixels and the rendering engine selects each of the one or more lines of pixels. As such, claim 1 is believed to comply with § 112, second paragraph.

As to claim 3, Applicants contend that claim 3 does not conflict with claim 1, but rather further defines the technique determining whether each of the pixels falls within the triangular area.

As to claim 11, Applicants contend that claim 11 does not conflict with claim 1 as claim 11 recites selectively rendering the pixels that fall within the triangular area.

As to claim 15, claim 1 has been amended to recite storing information indicating which of the pixels fall within the triangle area. As such, claim 1 provides antecedent basis for the storing of pixels in cache memory.

Based on the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejections are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In this regard, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the rendering engine stores information indicating which of the pixels fall within the triangle area. In a telephone interview of July 3, 2007 the Examiner tentatively agreed that such an amendment would amount to a concrete, useful and tangible result and would overcome the § 101 rejection. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 101 rejections are respectfully requested.

New Claims

Claims 32 to 76 have been newly added. These claims are means-plus-function, method, and computer program product claims, respectively, that correspond generally to apparatus claims 1 to 15. Examination of claims 32 to 76 is respectfully requested.

No other issues being raised, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 07/03/2007

By: /Matthew J. Evans/  
Matthew J. Evans  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 56,530

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-2779  
Telephone: (858) 651-7571  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502